arXiv:1612.09195v1 [stat.AP] 29 Dec 2016

A simulations approach for meta-analysis of genetic association studies based on additive genetic model

Majnu John[a,b,c,1], Todd Lencz[a,b,d], Anil K Malhotra[a,b,d], Christoph U Correll[a,b,d], Jian-Ping Zhang[a,b,d]

[a] *Center for Psychiatric Neuroscience, The Feinstein Institute of Medical Research, Manhasset, NY.*

[b] *Psychiatry Research, Zucker Hillside Hospital, Northwell Health System, Glen Oaks, NY.*

[c] *Department of Mathematics, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY.*

[d] *Departments of Psychiatry and of Molecular Medicine, Hofstra Northwell School of Medicine, Hempstead, NY.*

Abstract

Genetic association studies are becoming an important component of medical research. To cite one instance, pharmacogenomics which is gaining prominence as a useful tool for personalized medicine is heavily reliant on results from genetic association studies. Meta-analysis of genetic association studies is being increasingly used to assess phenotypic differences between genotype groups. When the underlying genetic model is assumed to be dominant or recessive, assessing the phenotype differences based on summary statistics, reported for individual studies in a meta-analysis, is a valid strategy. However, when the genetic model is additive, a similar strategy based on summary statistics will lead to biased results. This fact about the additive model is one of the things that we establish in this paper, using simulations. The main goal of this paper is to present an alternate strategy for the additive model based on simulating data for the individual studies. We show that the alternate strategy is far superior to the strategy based on summary statistics.

Keywords:
genetic association studies, meta analysis, additive model, summary statistics, simulations

[1]Corresponding author: 350 Community Drive, Manhasset, NY 11030. e-mail: mjohn5@northwell.edu, Phone: +01 718 470 8221, Fax: +01 718 343 1659

1. Introduction

Over the last decade, genetic association studies (-both candidate based designs and genome-wide designs) have become one of the cornerstone techniques in detecting specific genetic variants related to any phenotype of interest. In association studies, genetic variation is typically measured using genotyping based on single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). In order to fix ideas, let us assume that a SNP of interest is named $rs1234$ and the corresponding genotypes AA, AB and BB, with A as the major allele and B as the minor allele (the risk allele). The phenotype of interest in our motivating example-studies was weight gain due to antipsychotic treatment. With the proliferation of association studies, it is often seen that the standardized differences in weight gain ("effect sizes") between any pair of genotypes vary across the studies. For this reason, meta-analysis has become the method that is being increasingly employed to assess the phenotypic differences across the genotypic groups.

Combining the effect sizes between genotype groups in a meta-analysis depends on the underlying genetic model. The most commonly considered genetic models are dominant, recessive and additive models. In a dominant model, allele B increases risk and the number of copies of B doesn't matter; that is, genotypes AB and BB carry the same risk. In the recessive model, two copies of allele B are required for increased risk; that is, AB is grouped together with AA, and both groups are assumed to have no risk. In an additive model, the increase in risk is proportional to the number of copies of allele B; that is, if the risk is increased r-fold for the genotype group AB, then it is increased $2r$-fold for BB[1].

Typically, in the association studies considered for the meta-analysis, summary statistics (mean, median, standard deviation etc.) for weight gain will be reported for each of the three genotype groups. If we consider the underlying model to be dominant, one may take the average of the mean (or median) weight gains reported for the groups AB and BB, and calculate the standardized difference between this average and the corresponding mean (or median) weight gain reported for AA, to get the effect size for each study. It is ideal to weight the average for AB and BB by their respective sample sizes. This is a valid strategy in the sense that if the meta-analyst had access to each study's data, and if he or she grouped together the weight gains for the individual patients in groups AB and BB, and took the standardized mean difference with the individual data from AA group, then the effect size obtained will be same as the one obtained using summary statistics mentioned above; at least conceptually same - practically there might be some differences, for example, if one did not weight by sample sizes. The same argument applies for the recessive model too. However, for the additive model, the results from crude approach based on combining summary statistics will not correspond with the results using the approach based on the individual data, if the analyst was to have access to the individual data. The crude approach for the additive model would be roughly as follows. Take the difference of the summary statistics (mean or median) for AB and BB, then do similarly for AA and AB, and then take the average of these two standardized pairwise differences to obtain the corresponding effect size. One of the things that we show in this paper, via simulations, is that this crude approach leads to biased results.

Since the approach based on summary statistics leads to biased results for the additive

model, the analyst will have to fall back on subject level data from each study to calculate the appropriate effect size. But, it is well known that very rarely does a meta-analyst have access to such data. The solution to this dilemma, that we suggest in this paper, is to generate subject level data via simulations based on the summary level data, in order to calculate the effect size for each study under the additive genetic model. We show via extensive simulations and real data that the simulations-based-approach that we propose is far superior to the crude approach, and gives results very similar to those that might be obtained if individual level data was available. Before causing any confusion, we would like to clarify the word 'simulations' used twice in the previous sentence. The new method proposed in this paper is based on simulations, and we compare this new method with the old method (that is, the crude approach based on summary statistics) also using simulations.

In section 2, we explain the methods more clearly using notations. In section 3, we explain the simulations comparing the two methods, and in section 4, we present the results of the simulations. Section 5 illustrates how well the simulations-based-method works for a real data example; that is, for a data set consisting of studies for which we had subject level data. In sections 2 to 5, the phenotype of interest (e.g. weight gain) was considered as a continuous variable. But, phenotypes could be dichotomous as well (e.g. overweight - yes/no). In section 6, we show how our approach can be extended for dichotomous phenotypes as well. Finally, we summarize our findings in the last section.

2. Methods

In this section we describe two methods for meta-analysis assuming additive genetic model in genetic association studies. We are interested in the additive effect of the 3 genotypic groups on a phenotype of interest. In our motivating example[2], the phenotype of interest was the change in body weight due to antipsychotic treatment in patients with schizophrenia. We assume that the means (m_1, m_2, m_3) and standard deviations (sd_1, sd_2, sd_3) of the phenotype of interest are given for the three groups along with the sample sizes (n_1, n_2, n_3).

Crude Approach. One way to find the additive effect (β_{crude}) would be to stack the three means m_1, m_2 and m_3 into a 3×1 column vector and regress it against a column vector of group indicators $[1, 2, 3]^t$. The β_{crude} thus obtained is just the average of the pairwise mean differences $m_2 - m_1$ and $m_3 - m_2$. The R codes corresponding to this simple approach would be

```
M.crude ← c(m1, m2, m3) #means
G.crude ← c(1, 2, 3) #group indicator variable
beta.crude ← summary(lm(M.crude~G.crude))$coeff[2,1]
```

In order to calculate the standard deviation of β_{crude} (that is, the denominator of Cohen's d), there is no straightforward approach. However, one could take the standard deviation for the mean difference between samples 1 and 2, sd_{12}, and similarly for samples 2 and 3, sd_{23}, and take the average of these two standard deviations, $(sd_{12} + sd_{23})/2$ as the standard deviation for β_{crude}. sd_{12} and sd_{23} are within group standard deviations, pooled across the corresponding groups. As mentioned by Borenstein and co-authors[3], the reason to pool is

that even if the underlying population standard deviations are the same, it is unlikely that the sample estimates sd_1 and sd_2 (used in the calculation of sd_{12}) and sd_2 or sd_3 (for sd_{23}) will be equal. The R codes for this part are

```
SD.crude ← c(sd1, sd2, sd3)
SS.crude ← c(n1, n2, n3)
sd12 ← sqrt((((SS.crude[1]-1)*SD.crude[1]^2) + ((SS.crude[2]-1)*SD.crude[2]^2))/(SS.crude[1] + SS.crude[2] - 2))
sd23 ← sqrt((((SS.crude[2]-1)*SD.crude[2]^2) + ((SS.crude[3]-1)*SD.crude[3]^2))/(SS.crude[2] + SS.crude[3] - 2))
sd.beta.crude ← mean(c(sd12, sd23))
```

We use the following well-known formula[3] to calculate an approximate variance for Cohen's d:

$$\frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1 n_2} + \frac{d^2}{2(n_1 + n_2)}.$$

Note that the above formula can be used only for a pair of samples. So, we use this formula to calculate $V_{d.12.crude}$ and $V_{d.23.crude}$ separately for the sample pairs 1 and 2, and 2 and 3. Similarly the correction factor

$$J = 1 - \frac{3}{4(n_1 + n_2 - 2) - 1},$$

for the conversion of d to Hedge's g is also used separately for the two pairs to get $J_{12.crude}$ and $J_{23.crude}$. Then g and variance of g for each pair are calculated as

$$g_{12.crude} = J_{12.crude} \times d \text{ and } g_{23.crude} = J_{23.crude} \times d,$$

$$V_{g.12.crude} = J^2_{12.crude} \times V_{d.12.crude} \text{ and } V_{g.23.crude} = J^2_{23.crude} \times V_{d.23.crude}.$$

Finally, g_{crude} and its variance $V_{g.crude}$ are obtained as a weighted average,

$$g_{crude} = \left(\frac{g_{12.crude}}{V_{g.12.crude}} + \frac{g_{23.crude}}{V_{g.23.crude}} \right) / \left(\frac{1}{V_{g.12.crude}} + \frac{1}{V_{g.23.crude}} \right).$$

Note that this weighted average was suggested by Hedges and co-authors[4] for combining effect size estimates.

Simulations Approach. Another approach to the same problem would be based on simulations. In this approach, we generate individual data from the normal distribution via simulations using, for example, the *rnorm* function in R, based on the mean, standard deviation and sample size for each genotypic group, reported for each study. A group indicator variable is created with n_1 1's, n_2 2's and n_3 3's, and the simulated individual data is regressed against the indicator variable to obtain β_{sim}, the numerator of Cohen's d. A one-way ANOVA test comparing the individual data across the 3 genotypic groups is then conducted. The denominator of Cohen's d for this approach is obtained as the square root of the ratio of between-mean-squares and the F statistic. This process is repeated 10,000 times and the average of Cohen's d's across all the 10,000 iterations is taken as the estimated Cohen's d for this approach. The corresponding R codes are given below.

```
Sim.Num ← 10000 ## number of iterations
```

```
beta.sim ← array(, Sim.Num)
sd.sim ← array(, Sim.Num)


       for(m in 1:Sim.Num) {


             sample1 ← rnorm(n1, m1, sd1)
             sample2 ← rnorm(n2, m2, sd2)
             sample3 ← rnorm(n3, m3, sd3)
             M ← c(sample1, sample2, sample3)
             G ← c(rep(1, n1), rep(2, n2), rep(3, n3))

             beta.sim[m] ← summary(lm(M~G))$coeff[2,1]
             sd.sim[m] ←  sqrt(anova(lm(M~G))[1,3]/anova(lm(M~G))[1,4]) }


             cohen.d.sim ←  mean(beta.sim/sd.sim)
```

The calculations for variance for Cohen's d, the correction factor for conversion from d to g, and then for g and its variance are all done in a pairwise manner as was done for the crude approach (See above).

3. Monte Carlo Simulations

In order to assess the performance of the two methods described above under various scenarios, we conducted Monte Carlo simulations. By "various scenarios" we mean the scenarios obtained by varying the following parameters: number of studies in the meta analysis, the underlying distribution from which the sample for each study was obtained, the sample sizes for each study, and the true underlying effect size for each study. The last parameter was varied by varying the means for the three genotypic groups in each study, as well the within-study standard deviation. Our goals were a) to see whether the newly proposed methods improved with larger number of studies in the meta-analysis, b) whether they improved with larger sample sizes for the genotypic groups in the studies, c) whether the performance depended on either the underlying distribution or the underlying true effect sizes. It was intuitive to hypothesize that the performance of the methods would improve with increasing the number of studies and the sample sizes. So, our questions for parts a) and b) were really how large was good enough.

The key step in the simulations-based method presented above is the generation of (simulated) individual data from normal distributions using the "reported" means, standard deviations and sample sizes of the three genotypic groups from each study. (Note that, for the simulation analysis presented in this section, there was actually no reported means or standard deviations, but these values were generated in such a way that they matched with reported values from one the real data sets (EUFEST) discussed in section 5. See below the discussion related to *mean.vec* for more details.) Thus, the first question that we considered was whether the performance of the simulations-based method was affected when the original data distribution was not normally distributed. For this purpose, we conducted Monte Carlo simulations in which the original data were sampled from 3 distributions other than normal: strongly right skewed, asymmetric bimodal and heavily kurtotic. For comparison purposes, we assessed the performance of the methods, by sampling the original data from

the normal distribution also. The shapes of the probability density functions for the four distributions considered are shown in Figure 1. If $g_{(\mu,\sigma)}$ denote the density function for a normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2, the formulas for the densities used for our simulation study are

$$
\begin{array}{lcc}
f_1: & g_{(0,1)} & \text{(standard normal)} \\
f_2: & \sum_{l=0}^{7} \frac{1}{8} g_{\left(3\left\{(\frac{2}{3})^l - 1\right\}, (\frac{2}{3})^{2l}\right)} & \text{(strongly right skewed)} \\
f_3: & \frac{3}{4} g_{(0,1)} + \frac{1}{4} g_{\left(\frac{3}{2}, (\frac{1}{3})^2\right)} & \text{(asymmetric bimodal)} \\
f_4: & \frac{2}{3} g_{(0,1)} + \frac{1}{3} g_{\left(0, \frac{1}{10}\right)} & \text{(heavily kurtotic)}
\end{array}
$$

Each of the above densities is a normal mixture. These densities correspond to the first, third, eighth and fourth densities considered in Marron and Wand (1992)[5], and have been used in simulation studies previously (for example, in John and Priebe (2007)[6]).



Figure 1: Four densities used for simulations

Once we chose a distribution from among f_1, f_2, f_3 and f_4, we then selected the number of studies, L, to be included in the simulation analysis. We considered scenarios with $L = 5, 10$ and 15. After the distribution and number of studies were fixed, the next task was to select a "mean vector", *mean.vec*, from among the following 3 triplets: $(4, 5.5, 7), (4, 5.5, 9)$ and $(4, 5.5, 11)$, and then to select a within-studies standard deviation σ_{WS} to be either $\sigma_{WS} = 1$ or 5. The approximate effect size corresponding to the various *mean.vec* and σ_{WS} are given in table 1 below.

Table 1. Effect size table				
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	Approximate true value of g
1	4	5.5	7	0.82
	4	5.5	9	1.28
	4	5.5	11	1.64
5	4	5.5	7	0.30
	4	5.5	9	0.48
	4	5.5	11	0.65

In the next step, we generated L means for the k^{th} genotypic group ($k = 1, 2, 3$) from a normal distribution with mean as the k^{th} component of the *mean.vec* and standard deviation equals 2, using, for example, the *rnorm* function in R. Thus the average mean triplet across all studies will be the *mean.vec* that we selected for this scenario, but we create variation across the studies by generating the mean triplet for each study from a normal distribution. Similarly, we generated L (within-study) standard deviations for the k^{th} genotypic group ($k = 1, 2, 3$) from normal distributions using the k^{th} component of the σ_{WS} selected. The codes for these steps with $L = 10$, *mean.vec*$= (4, 5.5, 9)$ and $\sigma_{WS} = 1$ are given below.

```
L ← 10 ## number of studies

mean.vec ← c(4, 5.5, 9)
  m1 ← rnorm(L, mean.vec[1], 2); m1[m1 < 0] ← mean.vec[1] ## L means for the 1st genotypic group
  m2 ← rnorm(L, mean.vec[2], 2); m2[m2 < 0] ← mean.vec[1] ## L means for the 2nd genotypic group
  m3 ← rnorm(L, mean.vec[3], 2); m3[m3 < 0] ← mean.vec[1] ## L means for the 3rd genotypic group


sd.ws ← 1
  sd1 ← rnorm(L, sd, 2); sd1[sd1 < 0] ← sd.ws ## L within-study SD's for the 1st genotypic group
  sd2 ← rnorm(L, sd, 2); sd2[sd2 < 0] ← sd.ws ## L within-study SD's for the 2nd genotypic group
  sd3 ← rnorm(L, sd, 2); sd3[sd3 < 0] ← sd.ws ## L within-study SD's for the 3rd genotypic group
```

With the means and standard deviations selected for the L studies, we generate the three samples corresponding to the three genotypic groups for each study. The sample size considered at this step was also varied. We considered 8 sample size triplets (each triplet giving sample sizes for each of the three allelic groups), ranging from small $(10, 15, 5)$ to medium $(35, 45, 30)$ to very large $(300, 400, 240)$.

Each of the scenarios described above was repeatedly generated 500 times (that is, we used 500 Monte Carlo iterations). At each iteration, the absolute difference between the g values from the original sample, and the g values obtained from either of the new approaches proposed in this paper was first calculated, and the mean difference across all studies was then calculated. The mean difference thus obtained was considered as the bias for the g values corresponding to either of the new methods at each iteration. The average of the above bias across all Monte Carlo iterations was presented as the mean absolute bias for g in the appendix tables A1 to A4. In the above case, the bias was calculated for the g for each study.

At each iteration in our Monte Carlo analysis, we also conducted a meta analysis based on random effects model to calculate a mean effect size, g-WM (that is, a weighted average of the g's across all studies) from the original sample and a mean effect size based on the g's obtained via either of the newly proposed methods. The absolute difference between the two mean effect sizes was averaged across all iterations and was labeled as the mean absolute bias for g-WM. Thus, across different scenarios, we compared the bias of the g's for each of

the individual studies as well as the bias of the weighted-averaged estimate of g obtained by a meta-analysis using the random effects model.

4. Simulation Results

Overall, the performance of the simulations based method was better than the crude approach, in all cases that we considered. In general, the performance of the simulations based approach improved with larger number of studies and larger sample sizes for the studies, although the same cannot be said for the crude approach. The simulations based method performed fairly well even when the underlying density was strongly skewed or heavily kurtotic, but when the underlying density substantially deviated from normal (as in the case of asymmetric bimodal density), the performance was slightly worse. The simulations based approach performed consistently well for all underlying effect sizes shown in table 1; however, the performance of the crude approach substantially worsened for larger effect sizes. We provide more details below.

Performance based on the number of studies. As hypothesized, the performance of both the methods improved, in general, when larger number of studies were included in the simulation analyses. For example, when the original data distribution was asymmetric bimodal, with a within-study standard deviation of 1, and with the means, and the corresponding sample sizes of the three genotypic groups being $(4, 5.5, 7)$ and $(35, 45, 30)$, respectively, the bias for g-WM (the weighted average of effect sizes obtained using a meta-analysis based on random effects model) was 0.0661, when the simulations based method was used and the number of studies was 5. For the same setting, when the number of studies was increased to 10, the corresponding bias reduced to 0.0602 (about 8.9% reduction), and when the number of studies was further increased to 15, the bias was further reduced to 0.0479 (about 27.5% reduction). A similar trend was observed for the crude approach also: the bias values corresponding to study-sizes of 5, 10 and 15 were respectively 0.2500, 0.2492 and 0.2479, but the percent reductions, which amounted to 0.32% and 0.84% were much lower. Although the above pattern was observed in most of the scenarios there were certain cases, especially when the sample sizes were low, where the crude approach did worse with increasing number of studies. For example, when the original data distribution was strongly right skewed, with a within-study standard deviation of 1, and with the means, and the corresponding sample sizes of the three genotypic groups being $(4, 5.5, 11)$ and $(10, 15, 5)$, respectively, the bias for g-WM went up from 0.6018 to 0.7447 and then changed to 0.7306 as the number of studies went up from 5 to 10, and then to 15, when the crude approach was used. On the other hand, for the same setting, the corresponding bias values for the simulations based approach decreased from 0.1513 to 0.1016 (32.8% reduction), and further to 0.0821 (45.7% reduction) as the number of studies increased from 5 to 10, and then to 15.

Performance based on the sample sizes within studies. When all other parameters were kept the same, the bias values for both the crude approach and the simulations based approach went down, in general, as the sample size values within each study was increased. For example, when the original data was generated from the strongly right skewed density, with the three genotypic group means as $(4, 5.5, 11)$, with within-study standard deviation

as 5 and number of studies equals 10, the mean absolute bias for g-WM based on the simulations approach decreased from 0.0700 to 0.0357 (49% reduction), and then to 0.0125 (82.1% reduction), as the within-study sample size triplets increased from $(10, 15, 5)$ (small) to $(35, 45, 30)$ (medium), and then to $(300, 400, 240)$ (large); the corresponding bias values based on the crude approach were 0.1043, 0.0727 (30.3% reduction) and 0.0679 (34.9% reduction), respectively (See appendix table A2b). However there were a few scenarios for which the bias values based on the crude approach decreased initially as the sample sizes increased from small to medium, but then increased as the sample sizes increased from medium to large, even as the bias based on the simulations based approach reduced steadily as the sample sizes increased. The following example based on appendix table A1c illustrates the above point. With the underlying data normally distributed, with the three genotypic group means as $(4, 5.5, 11)$, with within-study standard deviation as 1 and number of studies equal to 15, the bias values based on the crude approach based on the sample size triplets $(10, 15, 5)$, $(35, 45, 30)$ and $(300, 400, 240)$ were respectively, 0.7006, 0.6449 and 0.7195 (that is, an initial reduction of 7.9%, but then an increase of 2.7%). Within the same setting and the same sample sizes, the bias based on the simulations approach decreased steadily from 0.0829 to 0.0371, and then to 0.0135.

Performance based on the underlying densities. As expected, when the underlying data distribution is normal, both the methods work better than when the data distribution is not normal. When the underlying distribution was asymmetric bimodal, the bias values of both the methods were somewhat larger compared to other distributions. When the underlying distribution was either strongly right skewed or heavily kurtotic, the bias values were slightly larger in general, yet comparable to those from the normal data distribution. For example, with a within-study standard deviation of 5, with the means for the three genotypic groups as $(4, 5.5, 11)$, and the sample sizes as $(10, 15, 5)$, the mean absolute bias for g-WM, using the crude approach, for the four densities f_1 (normal), f_2 (strongly right skewed), f_3 (asymmetric bimodal) and f_4 (heavily kurtotic) are respectively $0.0935, 0.1043, 0.1567$ and 0.0894; for the simulations based approach the corresponding four bias values were respectively $0.0692, 0.0700, 0.0953$ and 0.0707. As mentioned above, the values under f_2 and f_4 were similar to those for f_1, but values for f_3 were much larger. The pattern remained the same even for larger sample sizes. With all the parameters exactly same as in the above example, but with sample sizes $(300, 400, 240)$, the four bias values corresponding to the densities f_1 to f_4 for the crude approach were $0.0714, 0.0679, 0.1305$ and 0.0669, and for the simulations based approach were $0.0111, 0.0125, 0.0541$ and 0.0099.

Performance based on effect sizes. For small effect sizes, although the simulations based method edged out slightly over the crude approach, the performance of both the methods were more or less the same. For example, when the underlying density was strongly right skewed and number of studies was 10 (appendix table A2b), with a within-study standard deviation of 5 and means $(4, 5.5, 7)$ (that is, an effect size approximately 0.30; see table 1), when the sample size triplet was $(10, 15, 5)$, the bias value for the crude approach was 0.0723 and for the simulations based approach was 0.0684. As the sample size increased for the same underlying effect size, the performance of both the methods improved substantially, even though the simulations based method still edged out a little bit - for the same parameters as above but with the sample size triplet as $(300, 400, 240)$, the corresponding bias values

were 0.0225 and 0.0117. As the underlying effect size increased, the performance of the crude approach got markedly worse than that of the simulations based approach, as seen by the examples that follow. When the underlying density was strongly right skewed and number of studies was 10, with a within-study standard deviation of 5 and means $(4, 5.5, 11)$ (that is, an effect size approximately 0.65), when the sample size triplet was $(35, 45, 30)$, the bias value for the crude approach was 0.0727 and for the simulations based approach was 0.0357. With same underlying density, same number of studies and same sample size triplet as in the above example, but with the within-study standard deviation as 1 and the mean triplet as $(4, 5.5, 11)$ (effect size approximately 1.64), the corresponding bias values for the two methods were 0.7001 and 0.0512.

5. Real Data Example

In order to further assess the performance of the methods proposed in this paper, we applied them to a real data example for which the subject-level data was also available for the studies included in the meta analysis. This example is part of the analyses reported by Zhang and co-authors[2]. Here we include only pertinent details sufficient to illustrate the methods proposed in the present paper and assess their performances. More details can be found in Zhang *et al*'s paper[2]. The goal of meta-analysis was to determine specific genetic variants associated with weight gain related to antipsychotic drugs. Primary outcome was change in body mass index (BMI). Literature search with inclusion/exclusion criteria narrowed down 72 reports from 46 independent samples. For 3 among these 46 independent cohorts, patient-level data were available. The three cohorts were the Second-Generation Antipsychotic Treatment Indications, Effectiveness and Tolerablity in Youth (SATIETY) study, European First Episode Schizophrenia Trial (EUFEST), and Zucker Hillside Hospital First Episode Schizophrenia Trial (ZHH-FE). Since patient-level data were available for these three cohorts, we could directly assess the additive effect of the alleles and compare it with the additive effects obtained from the crude and simulations based approaches (proposed in this paper) which utilizes reported summary means, standard deviations and sample sizes only. In the analysis reported in Zhang *et al*, SNP $rs1800544$ in the ADRA2A (adrenoceptor alpha 2A) gene was significantly associated with antipsychotic drug induced weight gain across 6 studies, including the 3 studies mentioned above, with the G allele increasing the risk. The SNP is located in the upstream of ADRA2A, and may be a binding site for transcription factors. The reported summary data for the three studies mentioned above, for the allelic groups for the SNP $rs1800544$ are presented in the table 2 below; the subscripts 1, 2 and 3 correspond to the genotypes CC, CG and GG.

Table 2. Reported Summary Statistics for the 3 cohorts in the real data example

Study/Cohort	M_1	M_2	M_3	SD_1	SD_2	SD_3	SS_1	SS_2	SS_3
SATIETY	11.45	12.16	14.73	8.29	8.38	9.63	63	63	42
EUFEST	4.04	5.35	4.67	5.11	5.88	6.44	74	40	9
ZHH-FE	3.24	2.44	3.64	2.11	1.23	2.42	25	24	21

Table 3 below shows the β's (numerator of Cohen's d), standard deviation of the β's (denominator of Cohen's d) and the Cohen's d's based on the patient level data, the crude approach and the simulations based approach. The values obtained using the simulations approach match very closely with the values calculated using patient level data, while as the

values based on crude approach differed substantially. All the β's and all the Cohen's d's from the simulations approach differed from those from the patient-level data only by 0.01 or less (percent error ranging from 0.54% to 1.79%). On the other hand, the percent error for crude approach ranged from 4.47% to 58.39%.

Table 3. Effect Sizes based on patient-level data and the two methods proposed in the paper

	Patient Level Data			Crude Approach			Simulations Approach		
Study/Cohort	β	SD_β	d	β	SD_β	d	β	SD_β	d
SATIETY	1.552	8.661	0.179	1.625	8.675	0.187	1.563	8.680	0.180
EUFEST	0.746	5.460	0.137	0.313	5.470	0.057	0.742	5.474	0.136
ZHH-FE	0.168	2.009	0.084	0.199	1.965	0.101	0.171	2.009	0.085

6. The case when the phenotype of interest is a binary variable.

The methods that we have discussed so far are applicable only when the phenotype of interest is a continuous variable, like for example, change in body weight. Sometimes, the phenotype of interest is a binary variable, and in such cases odds ratios or relative risks comparing the genotypic groups are reported. That is, if we denote the genotypic groups as, say, AA, AB and BB, then usually an odds ratio for the dichotomous phenotype of interest comparing AB and AA, and another comparing BB and AB are reported, and typically these two odds ratios differ from each other. Now the question is, if we do a meta-analysis with additive genetic model as the underlying model, how do we combine the pair of odds ratios reported within a study to get a single odds ratio for the additive model within that study. In this section, we present methods that addresses this question. Although we focus on odds ratios to explain our method, a very similar method can be worked out for relative risk as well. The method that we present here is based on a simple adaptation of the reconstruction of four-fold cell frequencies for meta-analysis by Di Pietrantonj[7]. This reconstruction was further studied in Veroniki and co-authors8.

An overview of our adaptation is easy to describe:

Step 1): Within each study, reconstruct the 2×2 table for each odds ratio using Di Pietrantonj's method[7]. Thus, after reconstruction, with our above notation, there will be a 2×2 table comparing the dichotomous phenotype of interest between AB and AA, and another one comparing BB and AB. Note that Di Pietrantonj's method can possibly give rise to two 2×2 tables for each odds ratio. Di Pietrantonj[7], and Veroniki (and co-authors)[8] select the correct one among these two, for each odds ratio, using a cut-off based on the event rate in the "treatment group or the control group" (- in our case, this would be event rate in either of the genotype group). Since, in genetic association studies, this event rate is rarely reported, we use a different approach to select the correct 2×2 table for each odds ratio. More details are provided further down.

Step 2): Once the 2×2 tables, one for each odds ratio within a study, are selected, we merge them to get a 3×2 table. That is, three rows, one for each genotypic group, and two columns, one for each category of the dichotomous variable.

Step 3): Generate (via simulations) two variables - 1) the binary variable for the phenotype of interest and 2) a categorical indicator variable for the three genotype groups - that reflect exactly the cell frequencies in the 3×2 table obtained in step 2 above.

Step 4): Run a logistic regression with (the *logit* of) the simulated binary outcome variable as the dependent variable and the simulated 3-genotype-groups indicator as the independent variable. Exponentiate the β co-efficient for the independent variable to get the combined odds ratio for the genetic additive model. Standard errors for the β can be utilized to calculated the 95% confidence intervals for the combined odds ratio.

We explain and illustrate the details of the above approach using an example. Before we get to the details of our approach, we describe the example first. We generated sample data for each of the three genotype groups (AA, AB, BB) with sample size 30 in each group, that eventually yielded the following 2×2 tables:

Table 4a.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
AB	18	12
AA	10	20

Table. 4b.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
BB	18	12
AB	18	12

Details of how we generated the data and how we obtained the above 2×2 tables from the data are somewhat irrelevant to our discussion, but a reader interested in these can find the details in the appendix B.

Thus, in our example, the odds ratio comparing AB with AA is $(18/12)/(10/20) = 3$ and the odds ratio comparing BB with AB is $(18/12)/(18/12) = 1$. If we use the formula

$$\sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{d}\right)}$$

for the standard error of the log-odds-ratio (here, a, b, c and d denote the cell frequencies of a generic 2×2 table), then we get the corresponding 95% confidence intervals for the two odds ratios as $(1.05, 8.60)$ and $(0.36, 2.81)$. Typically, the above odds ratios and confidence intervals are the only information reported when the results from the study's analysis are published (and hence the only information available for the meta-analyst). The 2×2 tables shown in Table 4 above are typically not reported.

However, someone who has the original data for this study (that is, the data that we simulated for this example and that we pretend as from an original study) could use a logistic regression with the binary phenotype (present/absent) variable as the dependent variable and the 3-genotype-groups indicator as the independent variable and then exponentiate the corresponding β to obtain the odds ratio with 95% confidence interval for the additive genetic model as 1.73 $(1.02, 2.92)$ (or 1.727774 $(1.021826, 2.921441)$ with more digits). If this (combined) odds ratio is available for the meta-analyst, then s/he doesn't have to look further (that is, s/he won't need the method described in this section). However, the combined odds ratio is seldom reported, but the two separate odds ratios (and their 95% confidence intervals) for pairs of genotypic group comparisons are the ones that are typically reported. The method described in this section would help the meta-analyst to recover/estimate the

unknown (-unknown to the meta-analyst, but not perhaps to the original data analyst-), combined odds ratio (1.73, in our example) and the confidence interval, from the two reported odds ratios (3.00 for AB vs. AA and 1.00 for BB vs. AB) and their corresponding confidence intervals.

For a generic 2×2 table given below,

Generic Table	phenotype present	phenotype absent	genotype group totals
Genotype group 2	a	b	m_1
Genotype group 1	c	d	m_2

Di Pietrantonj's formula for recovering a is

$$a = -\frac{\lambda \pm \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4\alpha\gamma}}{2\alpha},$$

where

$$\alpha = \left[(1 - \mathrm{OR})^2 + \mathrm{OR} m_2 \hat{\mathrm{SE}}^2_{\ln(\mathrm{OR})}\right]$$
$$\lambda = \mathrm{OR} m_1 \left[2(1 - \mathrm{OR}) - m_2 \hat{\mathrm{SE}}^2_{\ln(\mathrm{OR})}\right]$$
$$\gamma = \left[\mathrm{OR} m_1 (\mathrm{OR} m_1 + m_2)\right].$$

OR in these formulas denote the odds ratio obtained from the generic 2×2 table and $\hat{\mathrm{SE}}_{\ln(\mathrm{OR})}$ is the estimate of the standard error of ln(OR) obtained from the upper limit, UL, and lower limit, LL of the 95% confidence interval, as

$$\frac{\ln(\mathrm{UL}) - \ln(\mathrm{LL})}{2 \times 1.96}.$$

Based on the a estimated, we can obtain b, c and d as

$$b = m_1 - a; \qquad c = \frac{a m_2}{\mathrm{OR} m_1 + a(1 - \mathrm{OR})}; \qquad d = \frac{\mathrm{OR} m_2 (m_1 - a)}{\mathrm{OR} m_1 + a(1 - \mathrm{OR})}.$$

Note that there are two possible solutions for a, leading to two possible values for b, c and d, and hence two possible estimates for the unknown 2×2 table. Let us denote the cell entries in the two possible 2×2 tables as $[a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1]$ and $[a_2, b_2, c_2, d_2]$. As mentioned above, Di Pietrantonj and later Veroniki and co-authors devised methods based on event rates for one of the marginal groups that would help to decide on which among these possible 2×2 tables to be picked. Such event rates are sometimes reported for epidemiological studies or clinical trials, but rarely for genetic association studies. We devised a simple scheme, more suitable to our context, that'd help us recover the correct table.

Recall that there are two odds ratios that we are considering - one for AB vs. AA and the other for BB vs. AB, denoted from now on as $\mathrm{OR}^{\mathrm{AB}}_{\mathrm{AA}}$ and $\mathrm{OR}^{\mathrm{BB}}_{\mathrm{AB}}$, respectively. For each of these odds ratios, Di Pietrantonj's formulas[7] give two 2×2 tables. Thus in total there are four 2×2 tables. Our scheme for selecting the correct tables is best explained by working it out for the example that we are considering at the moment. For this example, the two possible tables for $\mathrm{OR}^{\mathrm{AB}}_{\mathrm{AA}}$ are

Table 5a.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
AB	18	12
AA	10	20

Table. 5b.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
AB	20	10
AA	12	18

and for $\mathrm{OR}_{\mathrm{AB}}^{\mathrm{BB}}$ are

Table 6a.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
BB	12	18
AB	12	18

Table 6b.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
BB	18	12
AB	18	12

There are four different ways to match the tables:

Table 5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6a, Table 5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b, Table 5b $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6a, Table 5b $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b.

A careful look at all the tables will immediately reveal that among the four combinations that match a table corresponding to $\mathrm{OR}_{\mathrm{AA}}^{\mathrm{AB}}$ with one of the tables corresponding to $\mathrm{OR}_{\mathrm{AB}}^{\mathrm{BB}}$, the only one that makes sense (that is, plausible) is Table 5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b, because this is the only pair where the rows corresponding to AB match. In all the other three table-matching-combinations, the estimates for the row corresponding to the AB genotype group doesn't match.

In this particular example, there was one combination (Table 5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b) where the rows for AB matched exactly. But, there could be other examples, where the AB-rows do not match exactly for any of the combinations. In such cases, we can calculate the "distance" for the corresponding AB-rows for all four table match combinations listed above (e.g. the "distance" could be the Euclidean distance, if one may consider the pair of values for the AB-row as a 2-dimensional vector), and select the combination where this distance is the minimum. Once we decide on the table-combination based on this criteria, then we can take the column-average of the corresponding AB-rows to get the AB-row for the final 3×2 table. The distances calculated for our example is given below:

Distance table.	Distance between the corresponding AB rows
Table 5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6a	$\sqrt{(18-12)^2+(12-18)^2} = 8.48$
Table 5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b	$\sqrt{(18-18)^2+(12-12)^2} = 0$
Table 5b $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6a	$\sqrt{(20-12)^2+(10-18)^2} = 11.31$
Table 5b $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b	$\sqrt{(20-18)^2+(10-12)^2} = 2.83$

Again, based on this minimum distance criterion, the combination that we will select is Table

5a $\leftrightarrow$ Table 6b. In this particular example, the AB-rows for Table 5a and Table 6b are the same, $(18, 12)$ and $(18, 12)$. Hence the average is also $(18, 12)$, so that by merging Table 5a and Table 6b, we get the final 3×2 table as

Table 7.	phenotype present	phenotype absent
BB	18	12
AB	18	12
AA	10	20

This completes step 2. In the next step we generate a phenotype (present/absent) variable and a 3-genotype-group indicator variable using the following R codes:

```
al.gp.ind ← c(rep(1, 30), rep(2, 30), rep(3, 30))
               # 30 is the sample size for each genotype group
ev.ind ← c(sample(c(rep(1, 10), rep(0, 20))),
           sample(c(rep(1, 18), rep(0, 12))),
           sample(c(rep(1, 18), rep(0, 12))))
```

In the R codes above, `ev.ind` is the phenotype (present/absent) variable with 1 = present and 0 = absent, and `al.gp.ind` is the genotype-group-indicator variable with 1 = AA, 2 = AB and 3 = BB. This completes step 3. In the final step, we run a logistic regression with `ev.ind` as the dependent binary variable and `al.gp.ind` as the independent variable, and then exponentiate the β for `al.gp.ind` to get the combined odds ratio for the additive genetic model as 1.727401. This is remarkably very close to the unknown combined odds ratio from the original study in our example, 1.727774. The difference is less than 0.001. Using the standard error for the β, we calculate/recover the 95% confidence interval as $(1.021726, 2.920464)$, which is also remarkably close to the original interval $(1.021826, 2.921441)$. Thus our slight adaptation of Di Pietrantonj's method works very well for this example. We did not conduct extensive simulations for the method presented in this section, since Di Pietrantonj[7] and Veroniki and co-authors[8] have studied elaborately the core method.

7. Conclusion

Meta analysis is being increasingly used to estimate the phenotype differences between genotype groups from genetic association studies. When the underlying genetic model is dominant or recessive, summary statistics from individual studies can be combined to get the pooled estimate in the meta-analysis. However, we show via simulations that when the underlying model is additive, the pooled estimate based on summary statistics leads to biased results. Since, data from individual studies is rarely available for the meta-analyst, we recommend using simulated data based on the summary statistics. We show in this paper that the method based on such simulations leads to much improved results.

8. Acknowledgements

Majnu John's work was supported in part by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health for an Advanced Center for Intervention and Services Research (P30 MH090590) and a Center for Intervention Development and Applied Research (P50 MH080173).

9. References

References

[1] Lewis CM. Genetic association studies: design, analysis and interpretation. Brief Bioinform. 2002 Jun;3(2):146-53. Review.

[2] Zhang JP, Lencz T, Zhang RX, Nitta M, Maayan L, John M, Robinson DG, Fleischhacker WW, Kahn RS, Ophoff RA, Kane JM, Malhotra AK, Correll CU. Pharmacogenetic Associations of Antipsychotic Drug-Related Weight Gain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Schizophr Bull. 2016 Nov;42(6):1418-1437.

[3] Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to Meta-analysis. Chichester (UK): John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

[4] Hedges LV, Shymansky KA, Woodworth G. Practical guide to modern methods of Meta-analysis. National Science Teachers Association, 1989.

[5] Marron S, and Wand M. Exact Mean Integrated Squared Error. Annals of Statistcs. 1992 20: 712-736.

[6] John M, Priebe CE. A data-adaptive methodology for finding an optimal weighted generalized Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon statistic. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis. 2007 51: 4337-4353

[7] Di Pietrantonj C. Four-fold table cell frequencies imputation in meta analysis. Statistics in Medicine. 2006 25: 2299-2322.

[8] Veroniki AA, Pavlides M, Patsopoulos NA, Salanti G. Reconstructing 2×2 contingency tables from odds ratios using the Di Pietrantonj method: difficulties, constraints and impact in meta-analysis results. Res Synth Methods. 2013 Mar;4(1):78-94.

Appendix A. Tables of simulation results

Table A1a. Original Data from standard normal density										
Number of Studies = 5							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.3829	0.2299	0.1995	0.0966
				15	20	10	0.3510	0.2203	0.1603	0.0794
				15	20	30	0.2972	0.1701	0.1272	0.0687
				15	45	30	0.3706	0.2579	0.1253	0.0623
				35	45	30	0.3290	0.2498	0.1055	0.0497
				75	100	60	0.3066	0.2401	0.0700	0.0298
				150	200	120	0.2764	0.2240	0.0472	0.0239
				300	400	240	0.2902	0.2508	0.0315	0.0164
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6053	0.4559	0.2209	0.1099
				15	20	10	0.4947	0.4000	0.1819	0.0881
				15	20	30	0.4005	0.2902	0.1394	0.0754
				15	45	30	0.4482	0.3438	0.1345	0.0670
				35	45	30	0.4907	0.4231	0.1156	0.0515
				75	100	60	0.4722	0.4286	0.0787	0.0315
				150	200	120	0.4660	0.4344	0.0529	0.0257
				300	400	240	0.4899	0.4528	0.0376	0.0196
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9037	0.7497	0.2483	0.1199
				15	20	10	0.7837	0.6901	0.1916	0.0997
				15	20	30	0.6235	0.5160	0.1568	0.0840
				15	45	30	0.6453	0.5342	0.1563	0.0845
				35	45	30	0.7449	0.6751	0.1282	0.0589
				75	100	60	0.7291	0.6827	0.0867	0.0318
				150	200	120	0.7380	0.7120	0.0564	0.0290
				300	400	240	0.7850	0.7387	0.0419	0.0212
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2085	0.0961	0.1988	0.0935
				15	20	10	0.1679	0.0864	0.1610	0.0773
				15	20	30	0.1417	0.0714	0.1303	0.0656
				15	45	30	0.1522	0.0729	0.1327	0.0590
				35	45	30	0.1026	0.0444	0.0950	0.0395
				75	100	60	0.0843	0.0434	0.0681	0.0292
				150	200	120	0.0576	0.0266	0.0464	0.0203
				300	400	240	0.0516	0.0268	0.0320	0.0154
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2224	0.1033	0.2013	0.0920
				15	20	10	0.1785	0.0922	0.1621	0.0772
				15	20	30	0.1490	0.0766	0.1336	0.0682
				15	45	30	0.1542	0.0680	0.1326	0.0604
				35	45	30	0.1142	0.0532	0.0976	0.0401
				75	100	60	0.0981	0.0590	0.0699	0.0294
				150	200	120	0.0667	0.0458	0.0328	0.0156
				300	400	240	0.0726	0.0428	0.0479	0.0209
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2444	0.1262	0.2050	0.0902
				15	20	10	0.1966	0.1068	0.1632	0.0768
				15	20	30	0.1571	0.0813	0.1383	0.0704
				15	45	30	0.1608	0.0703	0.1335	0.0625
				35	45	30	0.1326	0.0714	0.1014	0.0417
				75	100	60	0.1191	0.0838	0.0721	0.0296
				150	200	120	0.0967	0.0719	0.0493	0.0214
				300	400	240	0.0935	0.0731	0.0337	0.0158

Table A1b. Original Data from standard normal density										
Number of Studies = 10							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4157	0.1933	0.2326	0.0764
				15	20	10	0.3377	0.1787	0.1777	0.0552
				15	20	30	0.3083	0.1707	0.1342	0.0474
				15	45	30	0.3551	0.2128	0.1297	0.0462
				35	45	30	0.3108	0.2279	0.0998	0.0338
				75	100	60	0.2816	0.2125	0.0705	0.0222
				150	200	120	0.2853	0.2324	0.0494	0.0145
				300	400	240	0.2712	0.2183	0.0371	0.0130
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6007	0.4092	0.2432	0.0787
				15	20	10	0.4995	0.3650	0.1938	0.0586
				15	20	30	0.3896	0.2476	0.1633	0.0583
				15	45	30	0.4670	0.3326	0.1475	0.0616
				35	45	30	0.4782	0.3970	0.1169	0.0420
				75	100	60	0.4540	0.4019	0.0786	0.0263
				150	200	120	0.4658	0.4253	0.0554	0.0148
				300	400	240	0.4688	0.4372	0.0399	0.0136
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9001	0.7244	0.2559	0.0768
				15	20	10	0.7728	0.6490	0.1991	0.0620
				15	20	30	0.5594	0.4099	0.1855	0.0729
				15	45	30	0.6814	0.5550	0.1595	0.0610
				35	45	30	0.7433	0.6610	0.1279	0.0456
				75	100	60	0.7045	0.6577	0.0850	0.0300
				150	200	120	0.7453	0.7031	0.0617	0.0176
				300	400	240	0.7683	0.7344	0.0433	0.0138
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2234	0.0685	0.2186	0.0695
				15	20	10	0.1732	0.0540	0.1672	0.0482
				15	20	30	0.1353	0.0487	0.1227	0.0467
				15	45	30	0.1370	0.0438	0.1216	0.0405
				35	45	30	0.1007	0.0330	0.0939	0.0283
				75	100	60	0.0812	0.0315	0.0699	0.0235
				150	200	120	0.0606	0.0194	0.0486	0.0145
				300	400	240	0.0520	0.0221	0.0343	0.0107
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2335	0.0722	0.2220	0.0695
				15	20	10	0.1818	0.0632	0.1705	0.0492
				15	20	30	0.1400	0.0507	0.1256	0.0479
				15	45	30	0.1396	0.0466	0.1249	0.0434
				35	45	30	0.1102	0.0410	0.0969	0.0277
				75	100	60	0.0944	0.0408	0.0706	0.0239
				150	200	120	0.0749	0.0381	0.0498	0.0143
				300	400	240	0.0665	0.0419	0.0352	0.0108
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2530	0.0935	0.2241	0.0692
				15	20	10	0.1985	0.0842	0.1727	0.0504
				15	20	30	0.1464	0.0555	0.1308	0.0501
				15	45	30	0.1492	0.0528	0.1289	0.0461
				35	45	30	0.1278	0.0591	0.0999	0.0280
				75	100	60	0.1164	0.0736	0.0714	0.0244
				150	200	120	0.0979	0.0667	0.0510	0.0141
				300	400	240	0.0927	0.0714	0.0361	0.0111

Table A1c. Original Data from standard normal density										
Number of Studies = 15							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4404	0.1842	0.2143	0.0738
				15	20	10	0.3529	0.1937	0.1619	0.0369
				15	20	30	0.3204	0.1837	0.1329	0.0329
				15	45	30	0.3502	0.2064	0.1380	0.0337
				35	45	30	0.3003	0.2071	0.1000	0.0269
				75	100	60	0.2791	0.2014	0.0718	0.0213
				150	200	120	0.3066	0.2366	0.0494	0.0121
				300	400	240	0.2952	0.2396	0.0368	0.0110
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6261	0.3907	0.2375	0.0803
				15	20	10	0.5208	0.3784	0.1799	0.0401
				15	20	30	0.4280	0.2952	0.1510	0.0407
				15	45	30	0.4476	0.3060	0.1558	0.0403
				35	45	30	0.4666	0.3795	0.1124	0.0298
				75	100	60	0.4278	0.3717	0.0797	0.0261
				150	200	120	0.5009	0.4542	0.0560	0.0155
				300	400	240	0.4818	0.4419	0.0422	0.0124
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9440	0.7006	0.2601	0.0829
				15	20	10	0.7859	0.6528	0.2014	0.0450
				15	20	30	0.6324	0.4832	0.1736	0.0523
				15	45	30	0.6350	0.4979	0.1701	0.0446
				35	45	30	0.7311	0.6449	0.1214	0.0371
				75	100	60	0.6668	0.6208	0.0873	0.0283
				150	200	120	0.7919	0.7504	0.0614	0.0183
				300	400	240	0.7577	0.7195	0.0460	0.0135
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2224	0.0697	0.2110	0.0645
				15	20	10	0.1698	0.0394	0.1589	0.0317
				15	20	30	0.1350	0.0409	0.1244	0.0368
				15	45	30	0.1439	0.0381	0.1263	0.0324
				35	45	30	0.1032	0.0283	0.0960	0.0273
				75	100	60	0.0805	0.0262	0.0712	0.0213
				150	200	120	0.0607	0.0193	0.0485	0.0134
				300	400	240	0.0506	0.0196	0.0347	0.0095
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2355	0.0777	0.2137	0.0654
				15	20	10	0.1778	0.0482	0.1604	0.0322
				15	20	30	0.1399	0.0434	0.1286	0.0372
				15	45	30	0.1483	0.0409	0.1295	0.0333
				35	45	30	0.1124	0.0337	0.0984	0.0280
				75	100	60	0.0917	0.0402	0.0723	0.0213
				150	200	120	0.0748	0.0381	0.0495	0.0136
				300	400	240	0.0659	0.0378	0.0356	0.0099
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2580	0.0997	0.2151	0.0656
				15	20	10	0.1939	0.0678	0.1623	0.0327
				15	20	30	0.1464	0.0444	0.1336	0.0383
				15	45	30	0.1577	0.0480	0.1331	0.0341
				35	45	30	0.1277	0.0475	0.1010	0.0289
				75	100	60	0.1107	0.0651	0.0736	0.0215
				150	200	120	0.0991	0.0662	0.0505	0.0137
				300	400	240	0.0907	0.0664	0.0366	0.0103

Table A2a. Original Data from strongly right skewed density										
Number of Studies = 5							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.3808	0.2275	0.2511	0.1179
				15	20	10	0.3704	0.2077	0.1987	0.0935
				15	20	30	0.2933	0.1860	0.1419	0.0744
				15	45	30	0.4627	0.3399	0.1297	0.0640
				35	45	30	0.3384	0.2615	0.1136	0.0598
				75	100	60	0.2580	0.1966	0.0835	0.0393
				150	200	120	0.2727	0.2134	0.0556	0.0268
				300	400	240	0.3476	0.2986	0.0416	0.0203
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.5351	0.3683	0.2822	0.1350
				15	20	10	0.5413	0.3808	0.2308	0.1152
				15	20	30	0.4209	0.2793	0.1828	0.0914
				15	45	30	0.5838	0.4453	0.1520	0.0755
				35	45	30	0.4889	0.4182	0.1377	0.0746
				75	100	60	0.4375	0.3800	0.0954	0.0446
				150	200	120	0.4442	0.4113	0.0629	0.0279
				300	400	240	0.5385	0.4977	0.0515	0.0267
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.7905	0.6018	0.3165	0.1513
				15	20	10	0.8277	0.6335	0.2590	0.1273
				15	20	30	0.6337	0.4587	0.2109	0.1026
				15	45	30	0.7701	0.6212	0.1811	0.1001
				35	45	30	0.7286	0.6331	0.1609	0.0867
				75	100	60	0.7081	0.6646	0.1038	0.0490
				150	200	120	0.7416	0.7093	0.0722	0.0328
				300	400	240	0.8530	0.8260	0.0550	0.0298
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2323	0.1054	0.2224	0.0915
				15	20	10	0.1687	0.0760	0.1632	0.0774
				15	20	30	0.1344	0.0666	0.1236	0.0622
				15	45	30	0.1443	0.0655	0.1279	0.0534
				35	45	30	0.1138	0.0527	0.1058	0.0486
				75	100	60	0.0888	0.0396	0.0778	0.0340
				150	200	120	0.0676	0.0391	0.0517	0.0240
				300	400	240	0.0532	0.0311	0.0347	0.0157
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2498	0.1139	0.2300	0.0957
				15	20	10	0.1822	0.0842	0.1724	0.0824
				15	20	30	0.1416	0.0746	0.1326	0.0684
				15	45	30	0.1528	0.0655	0.1324	0.0560
				35	45	30	0.1251	0.0616	0.1104	0.0537
				75	100	60	0.1021	0.0510	0.0803	0.0344
				150	200	120	0.0835	0.0591	0.0533	0.0242
				300	400	240	0.0721	0.0510	0.0372	0.0172
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2725	0.1320	0.2397	0.1021
				15	20	10	0.2000	0.0995	0.1802	0.0854
				15	20	30	0.1519	0.0813	0.1428	0.0732
				15	45	30	0.1613	0.0724	0.1392	0.0589
				35	45	30	0.1433	0.0741	0.1153	0.0587
				75	100	60	0.1232	0.0742	0.0834	0.0349
				150	200	120	0.1085	0.0892	0.0557	0.0248
				300	400	240	0.1006	0.0808	0.0396	0.0187

Table A2b. Original Data from strongly right skewed density										
Number of Studies = 10							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4718	0.2340	0.2556	0.0832
				15	20	10	0.3490	0.2008	0.1856	0.0631
				15	20	30	0.3304	0.1959	0.1436	0.0450
				15	45	30	0.4147	0.2617	0.1481	0.0520
				35	45	30	0.3467	0.2429	0.1172	0.0432
				75	100	60	0.2840	0.2164	0.0859	0.0274
				150	200	120	0.2817	0.1962	0.0555	0.0183
				300	400	240	0.2703	0.2227	0.0388	0.0139
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6651	0.4418	0.2747	0.0926
				15	20	10	0.5253	0.3661	0.2243	0.0765
				15	20	30	0.4522	0.2946	0.1760	0.0545
				15	45	30	0.5396	0.3827	0.1763	0.0689
				35	45	30	0.5122	0.4274	0.1362	0.0495
				75	100	60	0.4682	0.4082	0.0970	0.0286
				150	200	120	0.4416	0.3939	0.0620	0.0210
				300	400	240	0.4437	0.4107	0.0449	0.0168
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9679	0.7447	0.2990	0.1016
				15	20	10	0.7988	0.6482	0.2401	0.0855
				15	20	30	0.6595	0.4927	0.1987	0.0601
				15	45	30	0.7407	0.5690	0.2088	0.0803
				35	45	30	0.7808	0.7001	0.1531	0.0512
				75	100	60	0.7543	0.6962	0.1040	0.0308
				150	200	120	0.7155	0.6840	0.0668	0.0261
				300	400	240	0.7349	0.7039	0.0495	0.0186
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2418	0.0723	0.2241	0.0684
				15	20	10	0.1705	0.0549	0.1639	0.0511
				15	20	30	0.1395	0.0458	0.1283	0.0407
				15	45	30	0.1456	0.0473	0.1214	0.0426
				35	45	30	0.1094	0.0431	0.1010	0.0358
				75	100	60	0.0836	0.0311	0.0720	0.0212
				150	200	120	0.0616	0.0253	0.0485	0.0163
				300	400	240	0.0482	0.0225	0.0337	0.0117
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2530	0.0812	0.2277	0.0693
				15	20	10	0.1818	0.0631	0.1701	0.0539
				15	20	30	0.1481	0.0448	0.1338	0.0423
				15	45	30	0.1513	0.0492	0.1273	0.0453
				35	45	30	0.1198	0.0535	0.1028	0.0362
				75	100	60	0.0969	0.0468	0.0744	0.0217
				150	200	120	0.0742	0.0419	0.0498	0.0177
				300	400	240	0.0628	0.0404	0.0352	0.0122
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2736	0.1043	0.2323	0.0700
				15	20	10	0.2003	0.0754	0.1760	0.0558
				15	20	30	0.1593	0.0452	0.1411	0.0439
				15	45	30	0.1610	0.0569	0.1348	0.0490
				35	45	30	0.1395	0.0727	0.1056	0.0357
				75	100	60	0.1194	0.0744	0.0771	0.0224
				150	200	120	0.0967	0.0700	0.0514	0.0190
				300	400	240	0.0861	0.0679	0.0368	0.0125

Table A2c. Original Data from strongly right skewed density										
Number of Studies = 15							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4125	0.2003	0.2456	0.0814
				15	20	10	0.3673	0.1902	0.1871	0.0441
				15	20	30	0.3131	0.1634	0.1491	0.0477
				15	45	30	0.4248	0.2665	0.1403	0.0443
				35	45	30	0.2919	0.1947	0.1167	0.0340
				75	100	60	0.3022	0.2353	0.0713	0.0243
				150	200	120	0.2887	0.2166	0.0556	0.0132
				300	400	240	0.3033	0.2501	0.0362	0.0126
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6115	0.4281	0.2695	0.0799
				15	20	10	0.5609	0.3867	0.2168	0.0608
				15	20	30	0.4175	0.2576	0.1756	0.0563
				15	45	30	0.5572	0.4020	0.1652	0.0509
				35	45	30	0.4557	0.3743	0.1445	0.0393
				75	100	60	0.4956	0.4433	0.0816	0.0283
				150	200	120	0.4721	0.4225	0.0649	0.0178
				300	400	240	0.4903	0.4553	0.0431	0.0159
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9083	0.7306	0.2865	0.0821
				15	20	10	0.8513	0.6581	0.2434	0.0763
				15	20	30	0.6007	0.4358	0.2027	0.0642
				15	45	30	0.7771	0.6164	0.1854	0.0520
				35	45	30	0.7512	0.6585	0.1601	0.0440
				75	100	60	0.7873	0.7333	0.0896	0.0321
				150	200	120	0.7584	0.7153	0.0726	0.0239
				300	400	240	0.7852	0.7526	0.0491	0.0176
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2427	0.0703	0.2258	0.0631
				15	20	10	0.1779	0.0474	0.1732	0.0432
				15	20	30	0.1389	0.0390	0.1320	0.0383
				15	45	30	0.1490	0.0362	0.1260	0.0315
				35	45	30	0.1097	0.0348	0.1044	0.0289
				75	100	60	0.0758	0.0268	0.0668	0.0189
				150	200	120	0.0604	0.0182	0.0480	0.0110
				300	400	240	0.0521	0.0225	0.0332	0.0104
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2603	0.0918	0.2316	0.0636
				15	20	10	0.1905	0.0557	0.1798	0.0460
				15	20	30	0.1471	0.0424	0.1386	0.0396
				15	45	30	0.1533	0.0404	0.1320	0.0348
				35	45	30	0.1223	0.0476	0.1106	0.0309
				75	100	60	0.0885	0.0450	0.0689	0.0199
				150	200	120	0.0744	0.0382	0.0499	0.0121
				300	400	240	0.0697	0.0443	0.0348	0.0113
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2867	0.1237	0.2392	0.0651
				15	20	10	0.2109	0.0728	0.1878	0.0492
				15	20	30	0.1588	0.0460	0.1467	0.0411
				15	45	30	0.1612	0.0479	0.1393	0.0382
				35	45	30	0.1423	0.0673	0.1170	0.0322
				75	100	60	0.1116	0.0722	0.0713	0.0210
				150	200	120	0.0977	0.0677	0.0522	0.0137
				300	400	240	0.0967	0.0748	0.0365	0.0121

Table A3a. Original Data from asymmetric bimodal density										
Number of Studies = 5							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4474	0.2842	0.2214	0.1132
				15	20	10	0.3959	0.2646	0.1746	0.0903
				15	20	30	0.3257	0.2465	0.1462	0.0800
				15	45	30	0.4514	0.3609	0.1366	0.0744
				35	45	30	0.3268	0.2500	0.1193	0.0661
				75	100	60	0.3091	0.2501	0.0866	0.0514
				150	200	120	0.2938	0.2506	0.0731	0.0511
				300	400	240	0.3109	0.2684	0.0694	0.0549
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6536	0.5111	0.2486	0.1185
				15	20	10	0.5830	0.4879	0.1939	0.0983
				15	20	30	0.4565	0.3746	0.1738	0.1017
				15	45	30	0.6238	0.5616	0.1634	0.0938
				35	45	30	0.5173	0.4797	0.1441	0.0951
				75	100	60	0.5008	0.4781	0.1010	0.0768
				150	200	120	0.4750	0.4525	0.0944	0.0796
				300	400	240	0.4774	0.4572	0.0953	0.0875
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9596	0.8128	0.2660	0.1255
				15	20	10	0.8741	0.7817	0.2143	0.1132
				15	20	30	0.7028	0.6035	0.1945	0.1149
				15	45	30	0.9031	0.8340	0.1903	0.1163
				35	45	30	0.8144	0.7876	0.1634	0.1228
				75	100	60	0.7995	0.7845	0.1186	0.0952
				150	200	120	0.7363	0.7202	0.1108	0.1001
				300	400	240	0.7428	0.7342	0.1136	0.1086
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2297	0.0972	0.2157	0.0952
				15	20	10	0.1742	0.0882	0.1671	0.0857
				15	20	30	0.1329	0.0660	0.1292	0.0640
				15	45	30	0.1582	0.0877	0.1302	0.0712
				35	45	30	0.1113	0.0571	0.1005	0.0525
				75	100	60	0.0861	0.0450	0.0747	0.0372
				150	200	120	0.0649	0.0411	0.0507	0.0287
				300	400	240	0.0598	0.0441	0.0442	0.0288
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2458	0.1125	0.2209	0.0975
				15	20	10	0.1848	0.1027	0.1676	0.0879
				15	20	30	0.1368	0.0664	0.1339	0.0662
				15	45	30	0.1602	0.0865	0.1356	0.0751
				35	45	30	0.1270	0.0800	0.1053	0.0610
				75	100	60	0.1050	0.0767	0.0792	0.0456
				150	200	120	0.0876	0.0711	0.0588	0.0402
				300	400	240	0.0862	0.0785	0.0532	0.0427
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2720	0.1443	0.2248	0.0993
				15	20	10	0.2094	0.1302	0.1686	0.0918
				15	20	30	0.1450	0.0711	0.1401	0.0712
				15	45	30	0.1647	0.0860	0.1422	0.0795
				35	45	30	0.1547	0.1193	0.1119	0.0708
				75	100	60	0.1347	0.1167	0.0841	0.0557
				150	200	120	0.1192	0.1089	0.0673	0.0524
				300	400	240	0.1237	0.1200	0.0631	0.0562

Table A3b. Original Data from asymmetric bimodal density										
Number of Studies = 10							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4523	0.2457	0.2135	0.0889
				15	20	10	0.3894	0.2341	0.1819	0.0701
				15	20	30	0.3141	0.2013	0.1441	0.0752
				15	45	30	0.3725	0.2546	0.1363	0.0581
				35	45	30	0.3137	0.2492	0.1181	0.0602
				75	100	60	0.3209	0.2641	0.0887	0.0524
				150	200	120	0.3472	0.2926	0.0761	0.0480
				300	400	240	0.3588	0.3041	0.0625	0.0461
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6790	0.5392	0.2332	0.0945
				15	20	10	0.6293	0.5597	0.1983	0.1115
				15	20	30	0.4620	0.3713	0.1701	0.0968
				15	45	30	0.4931	0.4135	0.1536	0.0906
				35	45	30	0.4798	0.4423	0.1391	0.0873
				75	100	60	0.5533	0.5240	0.1074	0.0793
				150	200	120	0.5766	0.5568	0.1055	0.0946
				300	400	240	0.5523	0.5378	0.0906	0.0840
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9939	0.8866	0.2901	0.1455
				15	20	10	0.8933	0.8201	0.2084	0.1137
				15	20	30	0.6706	0.5891	0.2006	0.1131
				15	45	30	0.7514	0.6904	0.1825	0.1214
				35	45	30	0.7834	0.7431	0.1494	0.0990
				75	100	60	0.8285	0.8051	0.1326	0.1098
				150	200	120	0.8009	0.7893	0.1221	0.1127
				300	400	240	0.7994	0.7925	0.1072	0.1034
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2262	0.0786	0.2213	0.0727
				15	20	10	0.1741	0.0648	0.1725	0.0567
				15	20	30	0.1405	0.0463	0.1325	0.0427
				15	45	30	0.1364	0.0457	0.1197	0.0417
				35	45	30	0.1106	0.0456	0.1061	0.0375
				75	100	60	0.0866	0.0451	0.0746	0.0316
				150	200	120	0.0727	0.0435	0.0545	0.0261
				300	400	240	0.0570	0.0346	0.0398	0.0214
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2435	0.0941	0.2192	0.0693
				15	20	10	0.1846	0.0810	0.1724	0.0585
				15	20	30	0.1517	0.0502	0.1434	0.0529
				15	45	30	0.1505	0.0584	0.1330	0.0559
				35	45	30	0.1244	0.0645	0.1075	0.0377
				75	100	60	0.1083	0.0785	0.0764	0.0408
				150	200	120	0.0928	0.0733	0.0609	0.0369
				300	400	240	0.0904	0.0782	0.0534	0.0397
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2924	0.1567	0.2362	0.0953
				15	20	10	0.1970	0.1134	0.1654	0.0608
				15	20	30	0.1398	0.0558	0.1345	0.0660
				15	45	30	0.1454	0.0481	0.1298	0.0607
				35	45	30	0.1495	0.1042	0.1143	0.0540
				75	100	60	0.1403	0.1176	0.0873	0.0526
				150	200	120	0.1205	0.1085	0.0660	0.0501
				300	400	240	0.1305	0.1271	0.0619	0.0541

Table A3c. Original Data from asymmetric bimodal density										
Number of Studies = 15							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4665	0.2749	0.2312	0.0802
				15	20	10	0.3695	0.2537	0.1786	0.0683
				15	20	30	0.3311	0.2384	0.1471	0.0652
				15	45	30	0.4150	0.3044	0.1397	0.0659
				35	45	30	0.3250	0.2479	0.1128	0.0479
				75	100	60	0.3188	0.2597	0.0931	0.0529
				150	200	120	0.3334	0.2703	0.0786	0.0519
				300	400	240	0.3371	0.2937	0.0655	0.0511
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6454	0.5243	0.2491	0.0996
				15	20	10	0.6392	0.5347	0.2050	0.0894
				15	20	30	0.4335	0.3251	0.1659	0.0753
				15	45	30	0.4990	0.4051	0.1632	0.0882
				35	45	30	0.5162	0.4633	0.1374	0.0770
				75	100	60	0.5730	0.5502	0.1028	0.0743
				150	200	120	0.5270	0.5108	0.0907	0.0776
				300	400	240	0.5399	0.5279	0.0882	0.0825
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9689	0.8433	0.2737	0.0884
				15	20	10	0.8685	0.7752	0.2066	0.0927
				15	20	30	0.6852	0.5711	0.1976	0.1001
				15	45	30	0.7605	0.6873	0.1766	0.1064
				35	45	30	0.8375	0.7917	0.1507	0.0964
				75	100	60	0.8397	0.8227	0.1215	0.0986
				150	200	120	0.9333	0.8284	0.1132	0.1017
				300	400	240	0.8358	0.8286	0.0993	0.0948
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2233	0.0789	0.2126	0.0679
				15	20	10	0.1793	0.0642	0.1698	0.0556
				15	20	30	0.1320	0.0369	0.1242	0.0374
				15	45	30	0.1399	0.0564	0.1248	0.0429
				35	45	30	0.1032	0.0358	0.0977	0.0299
				75	100	60	0.0841	0.0391	0.0747	0.0265
				150	200	120	0.0712	0.0432	0.0566	0.0277
				300	400	240	0.0620	0.0381	0.0432	0.0222
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2547	0.1045	0.2292	0.0663
				15	20	10	0.1826	0.0826	0.1655	0.0562
				15	20	30	0.1376	0.0466	0.1304	0.0484
				15	45	30	0.1502	0.0478	0.1320	0.0495
				35	45	30	0.1213	0.0678	0.1074	0.0432
				75	100	60	0.1103	0.0745	0.0795	0.0368
				150	200	120	0.0952	0.0761	0.0630	0.0372
				300	400	240	0.0829	0.0721	0.0479	0.0359
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2713	0.1487	0.2230	0.0762
				15	20	10	0.2018	0.1072	0.1702	0.0547
				15	20	30	0.1419	0.0502	0.1403	0.0650
				15	45	30	0.1453	0.0447	0.1300	0.0574
				35	45	30	0.1575	0.1141	0.1153	0.0562
				75	100	60	0.1440	0.1258	0.0828	0.0550
				150	200	120	0.1205	0.1083	0.0637	0.0428
				300	400	240	0.1207	0.1153	0.0602	0.0526

Table A4a. Original Data from heavily kurtotic density										
Number of Studies = 5							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4617	0.2848	0.2477	0.1173
				15	20	10	0.3794	0.2681	0.1833	0.0823
				15	20	30	0.3278	0.1952	0.1527	0.0698
				15	45	30	0.3809	0.2349	0.1434	0.0559
				35	45	30	0.3478	0.2534	0.1208	0.0598
				75	100	60	0.3805	0.3192	0.0825	0.0404
				150	200	120	0.3348	0.2887	0.0536	0.0259
				300	400	240	0.2578	0.1993	0.0388	0.0160
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.7155	0.5305	0.2708	0.1407
				15	20	10	0.5752	0.4717	0.2082	0.0961
				15	20	30	0.4638	0.2877	0.1840	0.0862
				15	45	30	0.5120	0.3831	0.1587	0.0684
				35	45	30	0.5492	0.4414	0.1414	0.0712
				75	100	60	0.6003	0.5469	0.0996	0.0540
				150	200	120	0.5332	0.4889	0.0643	0.0322
				300	400	240	0.3970	0.3512	0.0465	0.0186
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	1.0573	0.8815	0.2714	0.1471
				15	20	10	0.8831	0.7722	0.2264	0.0996
				15	20	30	0.6700	0.4892	0.2044	0.1016
				15	45	30	0.7480	0.6143	0.1681	0.0753
				35	45	30	0.8052	0.7034	0.1511	0.0784
				75	100	60	0.9272	0.8614	0.1104	0.0611
				150	200	120	0.8002	0.7604	0.0753	0.0378
				300	400	240	0.6668	0.6315	0.0499	0.0194
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2332	0.0990	0.2173	0.0938
				15	20	10	0.1732	0.0873	0.1627	0.0734
				15	20	30	0.1320	0.0571	0.1238	0.0531
				15	45	30	0.1418	0.0642	0.1229	0.0543
				35	45	30	0.1092	0.0552	0.1055	0.0524
				75	100	60	0.0871	0.0406	0.0768	0.0313
				150	200	120	0.0624	0.0294	0.0517	0.0232
				300	400	240	0.0472	0.0231	0.0338	0.0147
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2521	0.1170	0.2228	0.0961
				15	20	10	0.1876	0.1001	0.1685	0.0726
				15	20	30	0.1424	0.0580	0.1296	0.0562
				15	45	30	0.1413	0.0659	0.1274	0.0544
				35	45	30	0.1234	0.0639	0.1082	0.0533
				75	100	60	0.1040	0.0565	0.0802	0.0333
				150	200	120	0.0760	0.0414	0.0539	0.0247
				300	400	240	0.0597	0.0354	0.0352	0.0151
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2800	0.1516	0.2285	0.0991
				15	20	10	0.2108	0.1229	0.1741	0.0728
				15	20	30	0.1563	0.0635	0.1382	0.0619
				15	45	30	0.1505	0.0693	0.1340	0.0549
				35	45	30	0.1440	0.0826	0.1115	0.0543
				75	100	60	0.1292	0.0830	0.0836	0.0354
				150	200	120	0.0978	0.0664	0.0562	0.0257
				300	400	240	0.0786	0.0560	0.0367	0.0154

Table A4b. Original Data from heavily kurtotic density										
Number of Studies = 10							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4454	0.2020	0.2372	0.0818
				15	20	10	0.3932	0.2059	0.1811	0.0519
				15	20	30	0.3036	0.1659	0.1411	0.0479
				15	45	30	0.4311	0.2731	0.1351	0.0440
				35	45	30	0.3234	0.2148	0.1149	0.0455
				75	100	60	0.2772	0.1991	0.0810	0.0294
				150	200	120	0.2946	0.2271	0.0551	0.0164
				300	400	240	0.3173	0.2506	0.0359	0.0110
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6363	0.4012	0.2660	0.0918
				15	20	10	0.5789	0.4294	0.2086	0.0625
				15	20	30	0.4004	0.2410	0.1804	0.0645
				15	45	30	0.5482	0.3839	0.1687	0.0586
				35	45	30	0.4902	0.3949	0.1329	0.0521
				75	100	60	0.4594	0.4004	0.0910	0.0335
				150	200	120	0.4786	0.4375	0.0640	0.0190
				300	400	240	0.5036	0.4580	0.0420	0.0139
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.9255	0.7217	0.2755	0.0960
				15	20	10	0.8868	0.7319	0.2363	0.0744
				15	20	30	0.5978	0.4082	0.2066	0.0723
				15	45	30	0.7779	0.5816	0.1925	0.0679
				35	45	30	0.7438	0.6455	0.1503	0.0544
				75	100	60	0.7469	0.6891	0.0998	0.0393
				150	200	120	0.7928	0.7593	0.0703	0.0230
				300	400	240	0.8014	0.7622	0.0470	0.0161
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2452	0.0728	0.2295	0.0696
				15	20	10	0.1815	0.0489	0.1697	0.0493
				15	20	30	0.1365	0.0488	0.1250	0.0403
				15	45	30	0.1558	0.0480	0.1316	0.0371
				35	45	30	0.1095	0.0354	0.1028	0.0346
				75	100	60	0.0790	0.0279	0.0687	0.0222
				150	200	120	0.0652	0.0216	0.0510	0.0138
				300	400	240	0.0527	0.0214	0.0333	0.0093
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2543	0.0745	0.2346	0.0746
				15	20	10	0.1932	0.0601	0.1762	0.0507
				15	20	30	0.1422	0.0549	0.1316	0.0429
				15	45	30	0.1598	0.0455	0.1365	0.0392
				35	45	30	0.1229	0.0445	0.1079	0.0367
				75	100	60	0.0899	0.0381	0.0708	0.0230
				150	200	120	0.0793	0.0386	0.0526	0.0147
				300	400	240	0.0679	0.0393	0.0342	0.0096
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2731	0.0894	0.2392	0.0707
				15	20	10	0.2134	0.0821	0.1826	0.0533
				15	20	30	0.1513	0.0601	0.1412	0.0461
				15	45	30	0.1697	0.0462	0.1421	0.0413
				35	45	30	0.1431	0.0639	0.1131	0.0389
				75	100	60	0.1097	0.0587	0.0734	0.0244
				150	200	120	0.1022	0.0666	0.0546	0.0158
				300	400	240	0.0922	0.0669	0.0355	0.0099

Table A4c. Original Data from heavily kurtotic density										
Number of Studies = 15							Crude Approach		Simulations Approach	
σ_{WS}	M_1	M_2	M_3	N_1	N_2	N_3	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM	Mean absolute bias for g	Mean absolute bias for g-WM
1	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.4574	0.2193	0.2552	0.0623
				15	20	10	0.3874	0.2266	0.1844	0.0538
				15	20	30	0.3315	0.1703	0.1528	0.0398
				15	45	30	0.3858	0.2285	0.1427	0.0412
				35	45	30	0.3085	0.2033	0.1158	0.0360
				75	100	60	0.3230	0.2313	0.0800	0.0209
				150	200	120	0.3544	0.2999	0.0536	0.0172
				300	400	240	0.2944	0.2337	0.0382	0.0119
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.6778	0.4616	0.2820	0.0704
				15	20	10	0.5835	0.4369	0.2144	0.0603
				15	20	30	0.4486	0.2756	0.1801	0.0480
				15	45	30	0.5070	0.3608	0.1642	0.0475
				35	45	30	0.4764	0.3846	0.1340	0.0376
				75	100	60	0.4977	0.4261	0.0919	0.0244
				150	200	120	0.5674	0.5272	0.0639	0.0188
				300	400	240	0.4922	0.4477	0.0433	0.0134
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	1.0062	0.8085	0.2918	0.0752
				15	20	10	0.8876	0.7497	0.2268	0.0595
				15	20	30	0.6437	0.4680	0.1981	0.0531
				15	45	30	0.7431	0.5911	0.1825	0.0492
				35	45	30	0.7542	0.6670	0.1400	0.0339
				75	100	60	0.7669	0.7021	0.0998	0.0281
				150	200	120	0.8667	0.8216	0.0734	0.0211
				300	400	240	0.7942	0.7479	0.0485	0.0156
5	4	5.5	7	10	15	5	0.2339	0.0615	0.2222	0.0577
				15	20	10	0.1739	0.0522	0.1659	0.0470
				15	20	30	0.1403	0.0355	0.1292	0.0325
				15	45	30	0.1505	0.0384	0.1328	0.0333
				35	45	30	0.1020	0.0262	0.0969	0.0258
				75	100	60	0.0819	0.0238	0.0712	0.0185
				150	200	120	0.0592	0.0232	0.0483	0.0136
				300	400	240	0.0484	0.0185	0.0349	0.0096
	4	5.5	9	10	15	5	0.2471	0.0714	0.2270	0.0578
				15	20	10	0.1886	0.0661	0.1724	0.0487
				15	20	30	0.1475	0.0399	0.1348	0.0340
				15	45	30	0.1556	0.0431	0.1382	0.0331
				35	45	30	0.1121	0.0298	0.1010	0.0273
				75	100	60	0.0953	0.0394	0.0736	0.0186
				150	200	120	0.0754	0.0422	0.0508	0.0145
				300	400	240	0.0644	0.0368	0.0366	0.0101
	4	5.5	11	10	15	5	0.2738	0.1046	0.2320	0.0584
				15	20	10	0.2108	0.0891	0.1799	0.0505
				15	20	30	0.1598	0.0464	0.1426	0.0362
				15	45	30	0.1640	0.0482	0.1437	0.0330
				35	45	30	0.1281	0.0478	0.1055	0.0285
				75	100	60	0.1163	0.0661	0.0759	0.0187
				150	200	120	0.1012	0.0718	0.0533	0.0153
				300	400	240	0.0898	0.0652	0.0384	0.0106

Appendix B. Data generation for tables 4a and 4b

Tables 4a and 4b were obtained as follows. (If one were to do simulation-analysis for section 6, one would repeat this procedure multiple times with variations in the mean triplet and standard deviation mentioned below.) First of all sample data from a normal distribution was generated for the genotype triplet (AA, AB, BB) assuming a mean triplet of $(4, 5.5, 7)$, and same standard deviation of 5 and equal sample size of 30 for each genotype group. The simulated phenotypic data thus obtained was dichotomized using a cut-off of 6; phenotype was considered to be present for values greater than 6, and absent otherwise. Two by two

tables were obtained based on the frequencies of the dichotomized phenotype categories in the various genotype groups considered two at a time - AA vs. AB for table 4a and AB vs. BB for table 4b.